



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,444	09/28/2006	Hideki Fujikura	Q97035	9060
23373	7590	07/03/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			RAHMANI, NILOOFAR	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		1625	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/03/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/599,444	Applicant(s) FUJIKURA ET AL.
	Examiner NILOOFAR RAHMANI	Art Unit 1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **28 September 2006**.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) **1-17,22-26 and 30** is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) **1-17,22-26 and 30** is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date **09/28/2006**

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17, 22-26, and 30 are currently pending in the instant application and claims 18-21, and 27-29 are cancelled.

Priority

2. This application was filed on 09/28/2006, which is a 371 of PCT/JP05/06702, filed on 03/30/2005, which claims priority of JAPAN 101893/2004, filed on 03/31/2004.

3. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1- 17, 22-26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1- 17, 22-26, and 30 are rejected because the term "derivative" is vague and unclear. Does it mean further derivative of formula I? How much of derivative is being claimed.

The word "derivatives" is indefinite for we do not know which compounds are contemplated. A derivative is the result of a reaction upon an organic molecule. Since we do not know the reagents or the conditions of these reactions, there is no way of determining the structures of the claimed "derivatives". The phrase "derivatives thereof" is, in essence, a product by process claim. Yet Applicants have not described the intended processes

sufficiently that we may understand the structures of the compounds they claim.

Webster's New World Dictionary defines derivative as "a substance derived from ... another substance by chemical change", and "substitution of one or more elements or radicals for one or more constituents of the original substance" has occurred. All implying that new chemical bonds have formed.

4. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-17, 22-26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-17, 22-26, and 30 are rejected because the term "general" formula is vague and indefinite. Is it only formula (I) or other than formula (I)? Correction is required.

5. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1- 17, 22-26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter, which was not describe in the specification in such

a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification lacks written description of the claim i.e. "derivative". No information was found in the specification that any and all known reactive derivatives can be used for the process.

6. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-17, 22-26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making prodrugs of the claimed compounds. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art of medicinal chemistry to use the invention. "The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as a) the quantity of experimentation necessary, b) the amount of direction or guidance presented, c) the presence or absence of working examples, d) the nature of the invention, e) the state of the prior art, f) the relative skill of those in that art, g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, h) and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ

546. a) Finding a prodrug is an empirical exercise. Predicting if a certain ester of a claimed alcohol, for example, is in fact a prodrug, that produces the active compound metabolically, in man, at a therapeutic concentration and at a useful rate is filled with experimental uncertainty. Although attempts have been made to predict drug metabolism *de novo*, this is still an experimental science. For a compound to be a prodrug, it must meet three tests. It must itself be biologically inactive. It must be metabolized to a second substance in a human at a rate and to an extent to produce that second substance at a physiologically meaningful concentration. Thirdly, that second substance must be clinically effective. Determining whether a particular compound meets these three criteria in a clinical trial setting requires a large quantity of experimentation.

b) The direction concerning the prodrugs is not found in the instant specification c) There is no working example of a prodrug of a compound the formula (I). d) The nature of the invention is clinical use of compounds and the pharmacokinetic behavior of substances in the human body. e) Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry) summarizes the state of the prodrug art. Wolff, Manfred E. "Burger's Medicinal Chemistry, 5ed, Part I", John Wiley & Sons, 1995, pages 975-977. The table on the left side of page 976 outlines the research program to be undertaken to find a prodrug. The second paragraph in section 10 and the paragraph spanning pages 976-977 indicate the low expectation of success. In that paragraph the difficulties of extrapolating between species are further developed. Since, the prodrug concept is a pharmacokinetic issue, the lack of

any standard pharmacokinetic protocol discussed in the last sentence of this paragraph is particularly relevant. Banker (Modern Pharmaceutics) Banker, G.S. et al, "Modern Pharmaceutics, 3ed.", Marcel Dekker, New York, 1996, pages 451 and 596. in the first sentence, third paragraph on page 596 states that "extensive development must be undertaken" to find a prodrug. f) Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry) in the last paragraph on page 975 describes the artisans making Applicants' prodrugs as a collaborative team of synthetic pharmaceutical chemists and metabolism experts. All would have a Ph. D. degree and several years of industrial experience. g) It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of thousands of compounds of formula of claim 1 as well as the presently unknown list of potential prodrug derivatives embraced by claim 1.

7. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 6-17, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for example 1, (2-(4-Methoxybenzyl)phenyl 6-O-triphenylmethyl-B-D-glycopyranoside) for some

IC50, does not reasonably provide enablement for the full scope of the compound of formula (I) to inhibit SGLT. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

- 1) The breadth of the claims.
- 2) The nature of the invention,
- 3) The state of the prior art,
- 4) The level of one of ordinary skill,
- 5) The level of predictability in the art,
- 6) The amount of direction provided by the inventor,
- 7) The existence of working examples,
- 8) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The nature of the invention: The instant invention is drawn to method for the inhibition of postprandial hyperglycemia, which comprises administering an effective amount of a phenol derivative as claimed in claim 1.

The state of the prior art: "T-1095A and T-1095 are synthetic agents derived from phlorizin, a specific inhibitor of Na⁺-glucose cotransporters (SGLTs). Unlike phlorizin, T-1095 is absorbed into the circulation via oral administration, is metabolized to the active form, T-1095A, and suppresses the activity of SGLTs in the kidney. Orally administered T-1095 increases urinary glucose excretion in diabetic animals, thereby decreasing blood glucose levels. Indeed, the postprandial hyperglycemia after a meal load was shown to be suppressed by this compd. in streptozotocin (STZ)-induced diabetic rats. With longterm T-1095 treatment, both blood glucose and HbA1c levels were reduced in STZ-induced diabetic rats and yellow KK mice. In addn., there was amelioration of abnormal carbohydrate metab., i.e., hyperinsulinemia and hypertriglyceridemia, and of the development of microalbuminuria, in yellow KK mice. Thus, T-1095 may be a useful antidiabetic drug, providing a novel therapeutic approach for diabetes." (Oku et al., *Diabetes* (1999), 48(9), pages 1794-1800).

The predictability in the art: It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instantly claimed

invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would recognize that in regards to the therapeutic effects, whether or not the compounds of formula of claim 1 would be useful for treating hyperglycemia, comprising administering to a patient in need a therapeutically effective amount of phenol derivative according to claim 1.

Amount of guidance/working examples: Applicant provides examples for inhibitory effects on human SGLT1 and SGLT2 activity and tested compounds on pages 69-74. However, there are no examples in the instant specification showing that the instant compounds can treat hyperglycemia. Nor are there any examples of the diseases being either treated by SGLT1 and SGLT2.

The breadth of the claims: The breadth of claims is drawn to method for the inhibition of postprandial hyperglycemia, which comprises administering an effective amount of a phenol derivative as claimed in claim 1.

The quantity of undue experimentation needed: Since the guidance and teaching provided by the specification is insufficient for treating hyperglycemia, which comprises administering an effective amount of a phenol derivative as claimed in claim 1 is efficacious, one of ordinary skill in the art, even with high level of skill, is unable to use the instant compounds as claimed without undue experimentation.

The level of the skill in the art: The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment

of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by *in vitro* and *in vivo* screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Taking all of the above into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claims 6-17, and 22-26, for treating hyperglycemia using an effective amount of a phenol derivative as claimed in claim 1 is efficacious, have been enabled by the instant specification.

8. *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim1-17, 22-26, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for some R^3 and R^4 examples being alkoxy group, which are on page 66-68 of the instant specification does not reasonably provide enablement for alkylsulfonyl group or alkylsulfonyl group or alkoxy carbonyl or etc. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Therefore, the specification lacks enablement for the term " R^3 and R^4 ".

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Niloofar Rahmani whose telephone number is

571-272-4329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/NILOOFAR RAHMANI/

07/02/2008

/Rita J. Desai/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625